

## REMARKS

The Office action mailed March 15, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1-15 are pending. Claim 7 was rejected, claims 8-13 were objected to and claims 1-6, 14 and 15 are allowed. By this Response, claim 7 has been amended. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

### Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the specification for various informalities. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the improper heading "Disclosure of the Invention" and the Abstract.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Specification and Abstract, as amended, overcome the objection to the Specification. Therefore, the objection should properly be withdrawn.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishinakayama et al.

Applicants have amended claim 7 also to describe that the corrections are "based on a detection by the light detector about the light-transmitting state and the light-shielding state of the sensing light beam switched in compliance with the movement of the table." Applicants advise that this description inadvertently was omitted from the translation of original claim 7 in their PCT application. Claim 7 now also describes that the corrections are based on detection of light beam switch in compliance with "the turn of the arm mechanism," as well as movement of the table.

Claim 7 describes the second embodiment of the present invention as set forth beginning at page 23 of the specification and in Figs. 11 to 14 of the drawings. Claim 7, as amended, recites a correcting means for correcting reference positions of table (82) in *horizontal and vertical moving directions (X, Z)*, and for correcting reference positions of the arm mechanism

(84) in *the (horizontal) turning and the (horizontal) operating directions ( $\theta$ ,  $R$ )*. The corrections are based on detection by the light detector about the light-transmitting state and the light-shielding state of the sensing light beam (L), switched in compliance with movement of table (82) and *turning of arm mechanism (84)*. See the Specification, page 23, line 35 to page 26, line 36. Thus, according to the present invention, reference positions are corrected in *all the  $X$ ,  $Z$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $R$  directions* with *one sensing light beam (L)*. See the Specification, page 9, lines 12-16.

On the other hand, Nishinakayama et al. does not teach or suggest a correcting means for correcting reference positions in *all the  $X$ ,  $Z$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $R$  directions* with *one sensing light beam*. Instead, Applicants submit, the sensing light beam (66) of Nishinakayama et al. is only a “level-detecting light” which is used as a standard for movement in the vertical direction ( $Z$ ). See col. 5, lines 34-43. In Applicants’ view, the recitation “amending the provisional position coordinate about the  $X$ -coordinate” in Nishinakayama et al. at column 4, lines 47-48 actually should be read as “amending the provisional position coordinate about the  $Z$ -coordinate”. See col. 4, lines 50-52.

Since Nishinakayama et al. does not teach or suggest a correcting means for correcting reference positions in *all the  $X$ ,  $Z$ ,  $\theta$ , and  $R$  directions* with *one sensing light beam*, the claimed invention is novel and unobvious. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections and Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claim 7 for reciting “direction” instead of “directions”. The Examiner’s suggested correction has been incorporated into amended claim 7. The Examiner also objected to claims 8-13 as being dependent upon rejected base claim 7, but allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants respectfully submit that since claim 7, as amended, is novel and unobvious, claim 7 and its dependent claims (claims 8-13) should be found allowable.

**Request for Interview**


Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

### CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300**, Attorney Docket No. **033082M253**.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch  
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: September 14, 2006

1850 M Street, NW, #800  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329